

F

415

.9

F8 F82



BANCROFT
LIBRARY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

F415
9
F8F82

FREMONT—HIS SUPPORTERS AND THEIR RECORD.

THE OPINIONS OF OUR GREAT STATESMEN UPON THE MISSOURI RESTRICTION.

BY AN INDIANIAN.

The Black Republican candidate for the Presidency, though a senator of the United States for several months, was in his seat and participated in the proceedings of that body but twenty-one days; yet, during that time, he showed himself to be a most ultra pro-slavery man.

He is now the candidate of, and supported by, that class of abolitionists who demand that wherever Congress has the power, slavery shall be abolished.

When bill No. 226, "To suppress the slave trade in the District of Columbia," was under consideration, Mr. Seward moved an amendment, "To abolish slavery in the District of Columbia." Chase, Hale and Seward voted for the amendment, and FREMONT and DAYTON against it. (Senate Journal, 1st session 31st Congress, p. 627.)

Subsequently, when bill No. 347 was under consideration, the same amendment was proposed by Mr. Hale, and supported by Messrs. Hale, Chase and Seward, and opposed by Messrs. FREMONT and DAYTON. (Senate Journal, 1st session 31st Congress, p. 647.)

Under the responsibility of official duty, and the obligations of his senatorial oath, Mr. Fremont resisted the proposition to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, although he conceded the power. Yet, he is now the candidate of the party with which that measure is first in importance. What brought about this change in his views of right and duty in relation to so important a measure? Has he abandoned a high principle to attain a high position? Has his gaze been so intent upon the White House, that he would send his principles to the auction block; that he might reach the Presidency? Let the unprejudiced mind answer.

The Senate on the 14th of September, 1850, resumed the consideration of bill No. 226, "To suppress the slave trade in the District of Columbia," the third section of which provided, that any person who should induce or entice a slave to run away from his master should be imprisoned in the penitentiary for ten years. Senator Badger, of North Carolina, moved to strike out the clause denouncing a penalty of ten years' imprisonment, and insert, "For any time not exceeding five years."

Mr. FREMONT voted against this amendment. (Senate Journal, 1st session 31st Congress, p. 632.)

He was the only senator representing a free State who voted against

that wise and humane proposition, originating in the benevolent feelings of a southern senator. In his judgment, to persuade a slave to leave his master was a crime of such magnitude, that nothing less than *ten years'* imprisonment in a southern penitentiary would be an adequate punishment; and so stern and harsh must the law be, that the court should be denied all discretion in imposing the penalty, nor allowed to take into consideration the character, age, or intelligence of the accused, nor any mitigating circumstance. The amendment was proposed by a southern senator, an enlightened and able defender of southern rights and institutions, but it was too liberal, too indulgent to secure the vote of Mr. Fremont, though he represented a free State. To satisfy his convictions of right, the man who might encourage a faithful slave to escape from a cruel master, must be crushed with a penalty more severe than is usually inflicted upon the perpetrators of high crimes and infamous felonies in the States. For crimes against the property and persons of the people, the courts and juries may, in most cases, reduce the imprisonment to a term of two years; but the misguided enthusiast, or blind fanatic, who should encourage a slave to flee for liberty, is denied the mercy of the court, and must suffer a fixed and certain penalty of ten years' imprisonment in the penitentiary. So voted Fremont—and in giving that vote he stood *alone* among the senators from the *North*. That record stands unchanged; but where stands the man who made it?—the man who was so ultra in his views that a southern measure was not sufficiently stringent—he who was so quick and valiant to draw his sword for the South? Six years have passed since that record, but in that short period the relative position and strength of the sections, North and South, have greatly changed. The North has become powerful and defiant—whilst the South, by calling into action every energy, is scarcely able to maintain her constitutional rights, and her equality in the Union. A sectional party in the North seeks to seize and control the government, and this late champion of the South, John C. Fremont, is their candidate for the Presidency. He is supported by Seward, Sumner, Giddings, Chase, Wade, Hale, and their compeers—the acknowledged leaders and mouth-pieces of the Abolition party of the United States.

John C. Fremont has made no political record since his brilliant senatorial career; therefore to ascertain the opinions and sentiments that will govern him in his administration of public affairs, if the American people shall, by their suffrage, place him in the highest office in the gift of a free people, we must recur to the avowed and published opinions and purposes of his political associates.

The leaders of his party have a record—a record of vituperation against the Democratic party, against the federal constitution, and against the federal Union; this record we submit to the American people, and ask them to decide, in November next, whether the diversified interests of this great country are to be subserved by committing them to the management of such men.

On the petition of John J. Woodward and others, praying that a plan might be devised for a *dissolution of the Union*, the yeas were, SALMON P. CHASE, JOHN P. HALE, and WILLIAM H. SEWARD. (Senate Journal, 1st session 31st Congress, p. 129.)

These men are now the acknowledged leaders of Black Republicanism; they are of those who *profess* love for the constitution and the Union, whilst black and horrid treason has *possession* of their hearts; but when they nominated John C. Fremont, they declared to the world that "the constitution must and shall be preserved." This they did, only to deceive the confiding, and mislead the unwary. Their votes speak louder than their words. They use the language of patriotism and of love for the Union to secure the support of Union-loving men, whilst their votes, their acts, and their organization, lead only to a dissolution, and all the evils that must follow. They believe in the "higher-law" doctrine, first enunciated at a Black Republican (then called a Liberty) convention, held in the city of Buffalo in 1843, at which the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Salmon P. Chase as chairman of the Committee on Resolutions:

"Resolved, That we hereby give it to be distinctly understood, by this nation and the world, that, AS ABOLITIONISTS, considering that the strength of our cause lies in its righteousness, and our hopes for it in our conformity to the laws of God, and our support of the rights of man, we owe to the sovereign Ruler of the Universe, as a proof of our allegiance to Him, in all our civil relations and offices, whether as friends, citizens, or as public functionaries, sworn to support the constitution of the United States, to regard and treat the third clause of the instrument, whenever applied in the case of a fugitive slave, as utterly null and void, and consequently as forming no part of the constitution of the United States, whenever we are called upon, or sworn to support it."

This doctrine was reiterated in June, 1853, at Ravenna, Ohio, by a mass meeting of Free-soilers, which was addressed by CHASE, GIDDINGS, SAMUEL LEWIS, and JUDGE SPAULDING, (all of whom are now the champions of the Fremont cause,) by the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we cannot respect, nor can we confide in those lower-law doctors of divinity who hold human laws above the laws of God; nor can we concur in their teachings, that the divine law is subject to Congressional compromises."

And again announced by the Hon. Charles Sumner, in 1854, in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, asked, "If we repeal the fugitive-slave law, will Massachusetts execute the provision of the constitution without any law of Congress?" Will this honorable senator [Mr. Sumner] tell me that he will do it?" To which Mr. Sumner replied: "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" Mr. Butler continued: "Then you would not obey the constitution. Sir, standing here before this tribunal, where you swore to support it, you rise and tell me that you regard it the office of a dog to enforce it. You stand in my presence as a co-equal senator, and tell me that it is a dog's office to execute the constitution of the United States?" To which Mr. Sumner said: "I recognise no such obligation."

Welcome is Mr. Sumner to his senatorial honors, acquired by charging that only a "dog" could recognise or execute an express clause of the constitution of the United States, which, however, is in strict accordance with the Buffalo and Ravenna resolutions, and comports with the "higher-law" notions of the party who recently made Colonel Fremont their presidential candidate.

This doctrine, which makes the private notions or prejudices of each individual the paramount law of his political action, is but a practical development of the "higher-law" notions as applied to American poli-

tics by William H. Seward, who, in a speech delivered in the United States Senate in 1850, said :

"The constitution regulates our stewardship; the constitution devotes the domain to Union, to justice, to defence, to welfare, and to liberty. But there is a *higher law than the constitution*, which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes."

It is scarcely necessary to say that, with such ideas in the ascendant in any country, no government is practical, and anarchy and confusion, and brute force, must inevitably rule the hour. Bodies of men or individuals, maddened by sectional or party prejudices, will never want an excuse for the violation of unpalatable laws, so long as they are permitted to substitute the vagaries of their own distempered intellects as having a stronger claim to their obedience than the constitution of their country.

As a further development of this idea of individual sovereignty, Wendell Phillips, of Massachusetts, at a Free-soil meeting in Boston, in May, 1849, said:

"We confess that we intend to trample under foot the constitution of this country. Daniel Webster says: 'You are a law-abiding people;' that the glory of New England is, 'that it is a law-abiding community.' Shame on it, if this be true; if even the religion of New England sinks as low as its statute-book. But I say *we are not a law-abiding community*. God be thanked for it."

But the Black Republican platform says:

"The federal constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved."

In preservation of the "rights of the States," JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS, in the House of Representatives, in May, 1854, said:

"I look forward to the day when there shall be a servile insurrection in the South; when the black man, armed with British bayonets, and commanded by British officers, shall wage a war of extermination against the white man; when the master shall see his dwelling in flames, and his *hearth-stone polluted*; and, though I may not mock at their calamity, nor laugh when their fear cometh, yet shall I hail it as the dawn of a political millenium."

The man who uttered this *chaste* sentiment contributed more to the nomination of Fremont than perhaps any other man in the convention; he was the master-spirit of that convention, and was no doubt the author of that clause in the platform which declares "the rights of the States must and shall be preserved." Yes, such preservation "as the wolf gives to the lamb!"

But certainly that Black Republican party which *professes* so much love for the federal constitution and the union of the States must have a record in strict conformity to such professions. Let us, then, look to that record. Mr. Mann, of Massachusetts, in 1850, expressed his love for the constitution and the Union as follows:

"I have only to add, that, under a full sense of my responsibility to my country and my God, I *deliberately* say, better disunion, better a civil or a servile war, better anything that God, in his Providence, shall send, than an extension of the bounds of slavery."

At a celebration of the 4th day of July, 1854, by citizens of Massachusetts, in which the Rev. (?) Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and others, took the lead, the constitution of the United States was thrown into a fire, built for that purpose, and burnt in derision of the American Union.

Senator Wade, of Ohio, in a speech to a mass meeting of the Black Republicans, held in the State of Maine in 1855, according to the Boston Atlas, said:

"There was no freedom at the South for either white or black, and he would strive to protect the free soil of the North from the same blighting curse. *There was really no Union now between the North and the South*, and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertained feelings of more bitter rancor towards each other than these two sections of the republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, *was to be found in divesting it entirely from all taint of slavery. There was no Union with the South.* Let us have a Union, said he, *or let us sweep away this remnant which we call a Union.* I go for a Union where all men are equal, or for no Union at all, and I go for right."

This speech was vociferously applauded by the constitution-union-loving people of Maine.

These disunion sentiments, and the man who uttered them, were endorsed by the Black Republican legislature of Ohio in 1856, by re-electing him to the Senate of the United States. The Black Republicans of the great State of Ohio, therefore, respond faithfully to the sentiment: "*Let us sweep away this remnant which we call a Union.*"

This same party, at a convention held in Boston in 1855, adopted, by a unanimous vote, the following resolutions:

"15. *Resolved*, That a constitution which provides for a slave representation and a slave oligarchy in Congress, which legalizes slave hunting and slave catching on every inch of American soil, and which pledges the military and naval power of the country to keep four millions of chattel slaves in their chains, is to be trodden under foot and pronounced accursed, however unexceptionable or valuable may be its other provisions.

"16. *Resolved*, That the one great issue before the country is, the dissolution of the Union, in comparison with which all other issues with the slave power are as dust in the balance; therefore, we will give ourselves to the work of annulling this 'covenant with death,' as essential to our own innocency, and the speedy and everlasting overthrow of the slave system."

This same party "loves this Union!" yet, at various meetings and processions in Indiana, during the month of July, 1856, flags and transparencies were carried with but *sixteen stars*; emblematic of a northern confederacy of the sixteen free States. The same thing has recently occurred in the State of Maine:

"Hannibal Hamlin, Lot M. Morrill, and Charles W. Goddard, esq., of Danville, addressed a Fremont meeting at Norway on Monday, standing under an American flag, on which were only *sixteen stars*!

"The disunion flag, with sixteen stars only, still continues to float across the public highway in this village—an emblem of sectionalism, and a disgrace to the party who placed it there."—*Norway Advertiser*.

"The 'Portland State of Maine' has hung out a Fremont and Dayton flag, on which are only sixteen stars.

"A salute of sixteen guns was fired at Portland the day Hamlin was nominated for governor.

"Only sixteen States were represented in the convention which nominated Fremont and Dayton.

"These are significant signs of the disunion tendencies and feelings of the Black Republicans. They scarcely take any pains to disguise their hostility to the Union. Let those who love their country and desire to perpetuate the Union ponder these things, and then *do their duty*."

Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, in a speech delivered in Faneuil Hall, Boston, on the 2d November, 1855, said:

"Not that I love the Union less, but freedom more, do I now, in pleading this great cause, insist that freedom, AT ALL HAZARDS, shall be preserved. God forbid *that for the sake of the Union*, we should sacrifice the very thing for which the Union was made."

Our glorious Union was formed to promote the prosperity and happiness of the white race, and as a condition of the Union, expressed in the constitution, the rights of the slave States are recognised and guaranteed. Shall it be sacrificed to a false philanthropy, a wild and fanatical sentimentality towards the black race? You respond "yes," when you, as sectional men, support John Charles Fremont.

Wade, Sumner, and their political associates, have long and openly declared their disunion sentiments; they have violated their constitutional obligations; they have defamed our glorious constitution; they

have traduced their country, and have plotted treason against our beloved Union; they are the leaders of the black cohorts of Black Republicanism; whilst plotting treason, they are also plotting for the election of Fremont; and if successful in either, they will have accomplished their great first design, the disunion of these States.

Wendell Phillips issued a pamphlet in 1850, reviewing Mr. Webster's speech "on the constitutional rights of the States," in which is the following:

"We are disunionists, not from any love of separate confederacies, or as ignorant of the thousand evils that spring from neighboring and quarrelsome States, but we would get rid of this Union."

This man that uttered these delectable sentiments is a leading Black Republican of Massachusetts and New England, and his shrieks are loud and long for "free speech, FREE MEN, and Fremont."

The Black Republican-Know-nothing legislature of Massachusetts, in 1855, passed an act denominated the personal liberty bill, nullifying thereby an act of Congress, which, by the constitution, is a part of the supreme law of the land.

This "personal liberty bill," as has been well said, "menaces with *disfranchisement* any lawyer who appears for the claimant of the fugitive slave; menaces with *impeachment* any judge who issues a warrant or certificate, or holds even the office of commissioner under the federal law; and menaces with *infamous punishment* any ministerial officer or officer of militia who aids in its execution." And although Governor Gardner vetoed the bill because of its conflict with the constitution of the United States, yet this Black Republican and Know-nothing legislature passed it over the veto, and it became a law.

The legislature of Ohio, composed of the same material as the legislature of Massachusetts, at their session in 1856, passed laws nullifying the same acts of Congress.

Judge Spaulding, one of the leaders in the Black Republican convention from Ohio, said:

"In the case of the alternative being presented of the continuance of slavery or a dissolution of the Union, I am for dissolution, and I care not how quick it comes."

John P. Hale addressed the convention as follows:

"You have assembled, not to say whether this Union shall be preserved, but to say whether it shall be a blessing or a scorn and hissing among the nations."

Senator Wilson, on the 12th of June, 1855, in the Philadelphia Know-nothing convention, said:

"I am in favor of relieving the federal government from all connexion with, and responsibility for, the existence of slavery. To effect this object, I am in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the prohibition of slavery in all the Territories."

Mr. Wilson, by abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, would perpetrate an act of bad faith, highly injurious to the peace and quietness of the States of Virginia and Maryland, from whom the cession was made to the general government. He would demand of a Congress, composed of members from all the States, to denounce and abolish an institution recognised and protected by fifteen States of this Union; yet what cares he for the peace and harmony of the Union, or the great wrong that he would inflict upon the South, so that his morbid appetite should be gratified? But the abolishment of slavery in the

District of Columbia, and the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, Mr. Clay said, were "but so many masked batteries, concealing the real and ultimate point of attack. That point of attack is the institution of slavery as it exists in the States. Their purpose is abolition—universal abolition—peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must."

Mr. Banks, the present Abolition-know-nothing Speaker of the House of Representatives, and who declined the nomination of the New York Know-nothing convention in favor of Mr. Fremont, said:

"I am not one of that class of men who cry for the perpetuation of the Union, *though I am willing, in a certain state of circumstances, to let it slide.*"

Mr. Josiah Quincy, of Boston, in a speech in August, 1854, said:

"The obligation incumbent upon the free States to deliver up fugitive slaves is that burden, and *it must be obliterated from that constitution at every hazard.*"

General James Watson Webb, a Black Republican leader, said, in the Philadelphia convention:

"Our people come together from all parts of the Union and ask us to give them a nomination which, when fairly put before the people, will unite public sentiment, and, through the ballot-box, will restrain and repel this pro-slavery extension and this aggression of the slaveocracy. What else are they doing? They tell you that they are willing to abide by the ballot-box, and willing to make that the last appeal. *If we fail there, what then? WE WILL DRIVE IT BACK, SWORD IN HAND, and, so help me God! believing that to be right, I am with them.*" [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Let the ballot-box fail to elect Fremont, and the cartridge-box is threatened against the American people. The idiosyncracies of the Black Republican party must prevail, or the fire and sword must follow. They are truly a constitution Union-loving party.

Mr. Burlingame, in the House of Representatives, in 1856, said:

"The times demand, and we must have, an ANTI-SLAVERY CONSTITUTION, AN ANTI-SLAVERY BIBLE, AND AN ANTI-SLAVERY GOD."

The following extract is from the "Boston Liberator," a paper now warmly supporting Mr. Fremont:

"Justice and liberty, God and man, demand the dissolution of this slaveholding Union and the formation of a NORTHERN CONFEDERACY, in which slaveholders shall stand before the law as *felons* and be treated as *pirates*. God and humanity demand a ballot-box in which the slaveholders shall never cast a ballot. In this, what State so prepared to lead as the Old Bay State? *She has already made it a penal offence to help to execute a law of the Union. I want to see the officers of the State brought into collision with those of the Union.*"

These benevolent and patriotic sentiments meet with a hearty response from the leaders of this Union-loving-Fremont party.

But of all the damnable sentiments that have ever met the public gaze were those uttered by that prince of Black Republicans, WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, who, in a speech made in New York on the 1st day of August, 1855, spoke thus:

"The issue is this: God Almighty has made it impossible from the beginning for liberty and slavery to mingle together, or a union to be founded between abolitionists and slaveholders—between those who oppress and those who are oppressed. THIS UNION IS A LIE; THE AMERICAN UNION IS A SHAM, AN IMPOSTURE, A COVENANT WITH DEATH, AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL, AND IT IS OUR BUSINESS TO CALL FOR A DISSOLUTION. LET THAT UNION BE ACCURSED WHEREIN THREE MILLIONS AND A HALF OF SLAVES CAN BE DRIVEN TO UNREQUITED TOIL BY THEIR MASTERS.

"I will continue to experiment no longer—it is all madness. LET THE SLAVEHOLDING UNION GO, AND SLAVERY WILL GO WITH THE UNION DOWN INTO THE DUST. If the church is against disunion, and not on the side of the slave, then I pronounce it as of the devil.

"I SAY LET US CEASE STRIKING HANDS WITH THIEVES AND ADULTERERS, and give to the winds the rallying cry, 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, SOCIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY, AND UP WITH THE FLAG OF DISUNION.'"

This party, with these leaders and this record, ask the American people to vote for their candidate for the presidency, John C. Fremont. Are you prepared to endorse the doctrine that, for our civil government, there is a "higher law" than the constitution? Are you prepared to say you owe no allegiance to that government which gives you protection in your person and property? that you "are not a law-abiding people?" Can you find it in your hearts to utter that this Union "is accursed," and that the great compact of your fathers is "a covenant with hell?" If you can deliberately do all this, then, indeed, are you a Black Republican, and you ought to cast your vote for John C. Fremont. But truly might you ask, "Is thy servant a dog, that he shall do this thing?"

For two years past the opponents of the Democratic party throughout the United States have waged a cruel and relentless war upon foreigners and members of the Roman Catholic church. These classes have been proscribed—commercial rights and political equality have been refused them—their fitness to participate in the affairs of government has been denied. They have been driven from the ballot-boxes, beaten and murdered in the streets, their homes sacked, their houses burned, and their wives and children cruelly murdered. That was the work of superstition, proscription, and bigotry. And whilst the rights of man were thus being crushed, and human blood made to flow, Abolitionism and Know-nothingism were allies—brothers in the field. Against them was arrayed the National Democracy. True to its mission, that party fought for the rights of man, and the freedom of religion. It has defeated and scattered the oath-bound forces of Know-nothingism. Democrats have fought the battle, and the foreigner is made secure in his social and political rights and privileges; and, strange to tell, the Abolitionists now ask him to turn against his friends.

His sympathies are invoked in behalf of the negro, and he is told that the war which they had waged for two years against him has ceased. Were not the legislatures of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, in 1855, composed almost entirely of Abolition-Know-nothings? Those legislatures passed laws to elevate, socially and politically, the negro, whilst they denied social or political equality to the adopted citizen. They denied their State courts to a foreigner, who should apply for naturalization; they hampered their law with conditions, so as to prevent the adopted citizen from exercising the elective franchise; they elevated the negro, and degraded the naturalized citizen; they are of the leaders of Fremont, and still shout "Down with the foreigners," "Up with the negroes," and "Americans must rule America." They are still of the Abolition party, and still against the Democracy; they hate the adopted citizen; they trample upon the constitution; they accuse the Union, and sing pæans of praise and love to the negro. Such is the Abolition-Know-nothing party of those States, and such are the supporters of John C. Fremont for the Presidency.

David Kilgore, in the Indiana Constitutional Convention in 1850, in speaking of our adopted citizens, said:

"A man, then, who has no feeling in common with us, who never felt the pulse of liberty till he set foot upon our soil, such a man is to enjoy the opportunity and the right to vote

amongst us, whilst these rights are to be denied to the unfortunate black man, who has ten times more intelligence, and who has lived in the State of Indiana from his birth." [See debates in the Convention, vol. 1, p. 253.]

And at the Black Republican State Convention in 1856, he said :

"NO NOMINATION SHOULD BE MADE WHICH WOULD TREAD UPON THE TOES OF THE KNOW-NOTHINGS—neither should a nomination be made which would tread upon the toes of the Free-soilers—even the most ultra anti-slavery man. * * * * *

He was opposed to foreigners. They should be permitted to come to this country—to buy lands here—to till the soil, but they should be the horses, not the drivers. The Americans would hold the lines—the foreigners could draw the burdens. [This infamous sentiment was applauded.] The foreigner should not be allowed to make our laws. He might live under them and must obey them, but he should have no voice in the making of them."

This man is now the Know-nothing-Abolition candidate for Congress in the fifth Congressional district in the State of Indiana, regularly nominated by what they termed a "Republican Convention," and if elected, he is pledged to labor in Congress for the principles of his party—the elevation of the negro, and the degradation of the unfortunate victims of European oppression, who have sought an asylum in free America. To this work of self-debasement the foreigner himself is asked to give his influence and vote. Will he give his vote to such men, and prove to them and the world that what his enemies have asserted is true—that he cannot appreciate a free government—that he is unfit to be a freeman? Let the adopted citizen ponder well before he casts his vote for his enemies, lest they may hereafter point to this very act, as evidence of a want of intelligence and capacity to vindicate the rights of a freeman.

On the 19th day of June, 1856, John C. Fremont was nominated for the Presidency by a grand council of Know-nothings, in the city of New York, representing all the Know-nothings of the northern and some of the southern States. On the 30th day of June he accepted that nomination, and in his letter of acceptance he speaks of it as an honor conferred upon him, and tenders his "grateful acknowledgment" to the members of that council, and to "their respective constituencies," *for the "distinguished expression of their confidence."* The constituencies represented were the Know-nothing lodges and wigwags all over the country, in which, for two years before, the destruction or degradation of foreigners was planned and plotted—in which companies of men were armed, organized, and sworn to attack, beat, and murder the foreign-born citizen. From them Fremont accepts the nomination as an honor; and if he accepts their services to secure his election, must he not represent their sentiments, and give himself up to their work of hatred and destruction?

On the day after Fremont received this Know-nothing nomination, the New York Herald, a Fremont paper, made the following announcement:

"The sudden change which has taken place in the sentiments of the convention in regard to Mr. Fremont is attributable to the fact that that gentleman was waited on last night by a delegation from this party, with whom he had a long and earnest confabulation, extending into the small hours of the morning; that he then and there declared himself unreservedly in favor of the principles of the Know-nothing party, and would give them his entire and cordial adherence, and that he was perfectly convinced that if he did not receive the support of the American party throughout the Union, he had not the slightest prospect of being elected."

When Senate bill No. 343, making temporary provision for working the mines in California, was under consideration, Mr. Seward, of New

York, moved to extend to all persons "who shall have, in pursuance of law, declared their intention to become citizens," the same benefits and privileges conferred upon citizens of the United States relative to working the gold mines. Mr. Fremont voted against the proposition, (Sen. Jour., 1st ses. 31st Cong., p. 671.) The most bitter and proscriptive Know-nothings have conceded that the foreigner might come to our land and enjoy the profits of his labor, demanding only that he be socially and politically degraded. But Mr. Fremont would go further: by his vote in the Senate, he said, that among the thousands of adventurers in California the foreigner shall not mingle. Although he may have declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, he shall not be allowed the only profitable labor in California, but shall stand by until his full term of five years shall have expired—the mines in the mean time being exhausted or wholly occupied. The labor was profitable, and therefore he should be excluded from it. That principle, thus supported by Mr. Fremont, goes further: it excludes the foreigner from our rich lands, where his labor would secure him a rich return in plentiful harvests, and says to him, social and political inferiority shall be your condition, and poor lands and unprofitable labor your portion in this land of plenty. The Know-nothing council of New York could well afford to nominate a man who has shown so unmistakably his sympathy with that order in its hostility towards the foreigner.

James Buchanan, the candidate of the democracy, proscribes no man because of his religion or birth-place, but, adopting the republican sentiment that each man shall be judged by his own conduct, he has supported wise, just, and equal laws; his political career has been a long and useful one; he has been tried, and proved himself an incorruptible patriot, qualified for all the high positions which he has filled; he is against sectionalism, and will maintain the Union—the whole Union—upon the firm basis of the constitution; and, to use his own language, he "will cultivate peace and friendship with all nations, believing this to be our highest policy, as well as our most imperative duty." With James Buchanan as the candidate of the national democracy, opposed to John C. Fremont, the nominee of the sectional Know-nothing and Black Republican conventions, can we doubt a glorious triumph for the Democracy and James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania?

The Black Republican party allege that the great excitement, now prevailing to such an alarming extent throughout the country, has legitimately resulted from the repeal of the so-called Missouri compromise; and, in their denunciation of the Kansas-Nebraska act, they appeal to the fathers for the justification of their action in resisting the passage of the bill; they invoke the names of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe, to prove that the prohibition of slavery in the Territories by Congress was the settled doctrine of the early fathers. They would deceive you in the opinions entertained by those great statesmen, and would mislead you as to the cause of the excitement which is now almost wrecking this fair fabric. We quote from the fathers that they would invoke, to show that this excitement, properly and legitimately, is the consequence of the legislation

of 1820; that the prohibition of slavery in the territory north of 36° 30' was the first fire-brand to disturb the peace of the Union; that we are now realizing the almost prophetic language of that great statesman, Thomas Jefferson, when he said he considered the Missouri question "as the knell of the Union," and that "every new irritation would mark it deeper and deeper." But let these great men speak for themselves. In reference to sectionalism and the Missouri question, Jefferson said:

"The question is a mere party trick. The leaders of federalism, defeated in their schemes of obtaining power by rallying partisans to the principle of monarchism—a principle of personal, not of local division—have changed their tact and thrown out another barrel to the whale. They are taking advantage of the virtuous feeling of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line; they expect that this will insure them, on local principles, the majority they could never obtain on principles of federalism; but they are still putting their shoulders to the wrong wheel; they are wasting jeremiads on the miseries of slavery as if *we were advocates of it*. Sincerity in their declamations should direct their efforts to the true point of difficulty, and *unite their councils with ours in devising some reasonable and practicable plan of getting rid of it*."—*Jefferson's Writings*, vol. 7.

In a letter to Mr. Adams, dated January 22, 1821, he says:

"Our anxieties in this quarter are all concentrated in the question, What does the holy alliance, in and out of Congress, mean to do with us on the Missouri question? And this, by the way, is but the name of the case; it is only the John Doe or Richard Roe of the ejection. The real question, as seen in the States afflicted with this unfortunate population, is, Are our slaves to be presented with freedom and a dagger? For, if Congress has the power to regulate the conditions of the inhabitants of the States within the States, it will be but another exercise of that power to declare that all shall be free. Are we, then, to see again Athenian and Lacedæmonian confederacies? To wage another Peloponnesian war to settle the ascendancy between them? Or is this the tocsin of merely a servile war? **THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN; BUT I HOPE NOT BY YOU OR ME. SURELY THEY WILL PARLEY AWHILE AND GIVE US TIME TO GET OUT OF THE WAY.** What a bedlamite is man!"

In a letter to Lafayette, dated November 4, 1823, Mr. Jefferson said:

"On the eclipse of federalism with us, although not its extinction, its leaders got up the Missouri question, under the false front of lessening the measure of slavery, but with the real view of producing a geographical division of parties, which might insure them the next President. The people of the North went blindfold into the snare, and followed their leaders for a while with a zeal truly moral and laudable, until they became sensible that they were injuring instead of aiding the real interests of the slaves; that they had been used merely as tools for electioneering purposes, and that trick of hypocrisy then fell as quickly as it had been got up."

In a letter to Mr. Short, dated April 13, 1820, Mr. Jefferson says:

"Although I had laid down as a law to myself never to write, talk, or even think of politics, to know nothing of public affairs, and had therefore ceased to read newspapers, yet the Missouri question aroused and filled me with alarm. The old schism of federal and republican threatened nothing, because it existed in every State, and united them together by the fraternism of party. But the coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived, I feared would never more be obliterated from the mind; that it would be recurring on every occasion, and renewing irritations, until it would kindle such mutual and mortal hatred as to render separation preferable to eternal discord. I have been among the most sanguine in believing that our Union would be of long duration. I now doubt it much, and see the event at no great distance, and the direct consequence of this question; not by the line which has been so confidently counted on—the laws of nature control this—but by the Potomac, Ohio, and Missouri, or more probably the Mississippi, upwards to our northern boundary. My only comfort and consolation is, that I shall not live to see it; and I envy not the present generation the glory of throwing away the fruits of their fathers' sacrifices of life and fortune, and of rendering desperate the experiment which was to decide ultimately whether man is capable of self-government. This treason against human hope will signalize their epoch in future history as the counterpart of the model of their predecessors."

"I thank you, my dear sir, for the copy you have been so kind as to send me of the letter to your constituents on the Missouri question. * * * But this momentous question, like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment; but this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once

conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. * * * If they would but dispassionately weigh the blessings they will throw away, against an abstract principle, more likely to be effected by union than by secession; they would pause before they could perpetrate this act of suicide on themselves and of treason against the hopes of the world."—*Letter to Jno. Holmes, dated Monticello, April 22, 1820.*

"I am indebted to you for your two letters of February 7th and 19th. This Missouri question, by a geographical line of division, is the most portentous one I ever contemplated. * * * is ready to risk the Union for any chance of restoring his party to power, and wriggling himself to the head of it; nor is * * * without his hopes, nor scrupulous as to the means of fulfilling them."—*Letter to Mr. Madison.*

"The banks, bankrupt law, manufactures, Spanish treaty, are nothing. These are occurrences which, like waves in a storm, will pass under the ship; but the MISSOURI QUESTION is a breaker on which we lose the Missouri country by revolt, and what more, God only knows. From the battle of Bunker's Hill to the treaty of Paris, we never had so ominous a question. It even damps the joy with which I hear of your high health, and welcomes to me the want of it. I thank God I shall not live to witness its issue"—*Letter to John Adams, December 10, 1819.*

"The line of division lately marked out between different portions of our confederacy, is such as will never, I fear, be obliterated, and we are now trusting to those who are against us in position and principle, to fashion to their own form the minds and affections of our youth. If, as has been estimated, we send three hundred thousand dollars a year to the northern seminaries, for the instruction of our own sons, then we must have five hundred of our sons imbibing opinions and principles in discord with those of their own country. This canker is eating on the vitals of our existence, and, if not arrested at once, will be beyond remedy."—*Letter to General Breckenridge, February 11, 1821.*

"The Missouri question is the most portentous one which ever yet threatened our Union. In the gloomiest moment of the revolutionary war, I never had any apprehension equal to that I felt from this source."—*Letter to Mr. Monroe, March 3, 1820.*

Mr. Madison said:

"On one side it naturally occurs, that the right being given from the necessity of the case, and in suspension of the great principle of self-government, ought not to be extended further, nor continued longer, than the occasion might fairly require.

"The questions to be decided seem to be, first, whether a territorial restriction be an assumption of illegitimate power; or, second, a misuse of legitimate power; and if the latter only, when the injury threatened to the nation from an acquiescence in the misuse, or from a frustration of it, be the greater.

"On the first point there is certainly room for difference of opinion; though, for myself, I must own that I have always leaned to the belief the restriction was not within the true scope of the constitution."—*Letter to Mr. Monroe in 1820.*

"Hearken not to the unnatural voice which tells you that the people of America, knit together as they are by so many cords of affection, can no longer live together as members of the same family—can no longer continue the mutual guardians of their mutual happiness—can no longer be fellow-citizens of one great, respectable, and flourishing empire. The kindred blood which flows in the veins of American citizens—the mingled blood which they have shed in defence of their sacred rights, consecrate their union, and excite horror at the idea of their becoming aliens, rivals, enemies. And if novelties are to be shunned, believe me, the most alarming of all novelties—the most wild of all projects—the most rash of all attempts, is that of rending us in pieces in order to preserve our liberties and promote our happiness."

[*The Federalist*, p. 86.

"Should a state of parties arise, founded on geographical boundaries and other physical distinctions which happen to coincide with them, what is to control those great repulsive masses from awful shocks against each other?"—*Letter to Mr. Walsh, dated November 27, 1819.*

General Harrison said:

"I am, and have been for many years, so much opposed to slavery, that I will never live in a State where it exists. But I believe that the constitution has given no power to the general government to interfere in this matter, and that to have slaves or no slaves depends upon the people in each State or Territory alone.

"But besides the constitutional objections, I am persuaded that the obvious tendency of such interferences on the part of the States which have no slaves with the property of their fellow-citizens of the others, is to produce a state of discord and jealousy that will in the end prove fatal to the Union. I believe in no other State are such wild and dangerous sentiments entertained on this subject as in Ohio."—*General Harrison in a letter to President Monroe in 1821.*

In reference to sectionalism, and the nullification of the acts of Congress, General Jackson said:

"The laws of the United States must be executed. * Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution, deceived you; they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws, and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion, by armed force, is TREASON."—*Message of General Jackson, in 1833, on Nullification.*

"Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests, in order to influence the election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country, instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all; and the possible dissolution of the Union has at length become an ordinary and familiar subject of discussion. Has the warning voice of Washington been forgotten, or have designs already been formed to dissolve the Union?" * * * * "Mutual suspicion and reproaches may in time create mutual hostility; and artful and designing men will always be found who are ready to foment these fatal divisions and inflame the natural jealousies of different sections of the country. The history of the world is full of such examples, and especially the history of republics."

"And no citizen who loves his country would, in any case whatever, resort to forcible resistance, unless he clearly saw that the time had come when a freeman should prefer death to submission." * * * * "Rest assured that men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence, and deserve your strongest reprobation."

"In the legislation of Congress, also, and in every measure of the general government, justice to every portion of the United States should be faithfully observed. No free government can stand without virtue in the people and a lofty spirit of patriotism; and if the sordid feelings of mere selfishness shall usurp the place which ought to be filled by public spirit, the legislation of Congress will soon be converted into a scramble for personal and sectional advantages."—*Jackson.*

"And solemnly proclaim that the constitution and the laws are supreme, and the Union indissoluble."—*Jackson's Message, Jan 16, 1833.*

In relation to the very questions now agitating the country, the Sage of Ashland said:

"Sir, I am not in the habit of speaking lightly of the possibility of dissolving this happy Union. The Senate know that I have deprecated allusions, on ordinary occasions, to that direful event. The country will testify that, if there be anything in the history of my public career worthy of recollection, it is the truth and sincerity of my ardent devotion to its lasting preservation. But we should be false in our allegiance to it if we did not discriminate between the imaginary and real dangers by which it may be assailed. Abolitionism should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger. The abolitionists, let me suppose, succeed in their present aim of uniting the inhabitants of the free States, as one man, against the inhabitants of the slave States. Union on one side will beget union on the other, and this process of reciprocal consolidation will be attended with all the violent prejudice, embittered passions, and implacable animosities which ever degraded or deformed human nature. * * * One section will stand in menacing and hostile array against the other. The collision of opinion will be quickly followed by the clash of arms. I will not attempt to describe scenes which now happily lie concealed from our view. Abolitionists themselves would shrink back in dismay and horror at the contemplation of desolated fields, conflagrated cities, murdered inhabitants, and the overthrow of the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man."—*Speech of Mr. Clay in the U. S. Senate on the 7th of February, 1839.*

In the same speech Mr. Clay summed up what the abolitionists wanted, as follows:

"And the third class are the real ultra abolitionists, who are resolved to persevere in the pursuit of their object at all hazards. With this class the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the prohibition of the removal of slaves from State to State, and the refusal to admit any new State comprising within its limits the institution of domestic slavery, are but so many means conducing to the accomplishment of the ultimate but perilous end, at which they avowedly and boldly aim, are but so many short stages in the long and bloody road to the distant goal at which they would finally arrive. Their purpose is abolition—universal abolition—peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must."

The Fremont party of 1856 has assumed a position identical with the abolition party of 1839. How well the picture of abolitionism, drawn by Mr. Clay in 1839, suits the Republican party of the present day. They have but one common aim—the dissolution of this Union.

Mr. Clay, in speaking of our Catholic citizens, said:

"With regard to their superstition, they worship the same God with us. Their prayers are offered up in their temples to the same Redeemer, whose intercession we expect to save us. NOR IS

THERE ANYTHING IN THE CATHOLIC RELIGION UNFAVORABLE TO FREEDOM. All religions united with government are more or less inimical to liberty. All separated from the government are compatible with liberty."—*Speech in Congress, March 24, 1818.*

And in reference to our adopted citizens, he made use of the following language :

"The honest, patient, industrious GERMAN readily unites with our people, establishes himself on some of our fat lands, fills his capacious barns, and enjoys in tranquillity the abundant fruits which his diligence gathers around him, always ready to fly to the standard of his adopted country, or of its laws, when called by duties of patriotism.

"The gay, the versatile, the philosophical FRENCHMAN, accommodating himself cheerfully to all the vicissitudes of life, incorporates himself without difficulty in our society.

"But of all foreigners, none amalgamate themselves so quickly with our people as the NATIVES OF THE EMERALD ISLE. In some of the visions which have passed through my imagination, I have supposed that Ireland was originally part and parcel of this continent, and that by some extraordinary convulsion of nature it was torn from America, and, drifting across the ocean, was placed in the unfortunate vicinity of Great Britain.

"The same open-heartedness, the same generous hospitality, the same careless and uncalculating indifference about human life, characterized the inhabitants of both countries. Kentucky has sometimes been called the Ireland of America. And I have no doubt that if the current of emigration were reversed, and set from America upon the shores of Europe, every American emigrant to Ireland would there find, as every Irish emigrant here finds, a hearty welcome, and a happy home."—*Speech in the United States Senate in defence of the American System.*

The democracy now stand where Jefferson and Madison stood ; they have restored our territorial policy as it existed prior to that violent and unconstitutional departure in 1820. The exigencies demanded, and the democracy, true to the rights of man and the equality of the States, gave the country the compromise measures of 1850. These were endorsed by the Baltimore convention, ratified by the people in 1852 by the election of Franklin Pierce, reaffirmed by the democracy in the Kansas-Nebraska act of 1854, re-endorsed by the Cincinnati convention, and will stand confirmed by the American people in 1856 by the election of James Buchanan to the presidency.

This vindication of the right of the people to form their own domestic institutions is a vindication of the instructions given by the colonies to their delegates to form a confederation—a vindication of the spirit and letter of the immortal Declaration of Independence—a vindication of our glorious constitution, and a vindication of the inalienable rights of an American citizen.

Our opponents have been uniform in their hatred and denunciation of the Democratic party ; they opposed the election of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Jackson ; they repudiated the Louisiana purchase ; they denounced the war of 1812, and burnt blue-lights in their windows to light the enemys' ships into our harbors ; they endeavored to defeat the purchase of the Floridas and the annexation of Texas, and would have welcomed our brave soldiers in Mexico "with bloody hands to hospitable graves ;" they forced upon the people the restriction of 1820 by refusing to admit Missouri into the Union, and repudiated it in 1848 by opposing its extension to the Pacific. The legitimate consequence of such repudiation was the compromise of 1850, the passage of which they resisted by every parliamentary expedient, and by every appeal to a false and fanatical philanthropy. They counselled revolution on the floor of Congress, in resistance to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act, because it carried out the great principles

embodied in the compromise of 1850. They would subvert, through emigrant aid societies and other appliances, the practical development of non-intervention by Congress, and the right of the people to govern themselves; they would counsel the incendiary torch and the assassin's knife against the most sacred rights of American freemen in the Territory of Kansas; they have a deep and profound hatred against, and denounce in unmeasured terms, the doctrine that the *bona fide* residents of Kansas should adjust their domestic affairs in their own way; they have sought foreign aid, and have carried foreign assistance into the Territory of Kansas for the express purpose of interfering in the domestic policy of the people of that Territory; they are the authors and instigators of, and before God and man are responsible for, all the outrages, the arsons, and the murders in Kansas.

The democracy, true to the great doctrine of the early fathers, true to the rights of the States, the constitution, the Union, and ever watchful of the peace, happiness, and prosperity of a free people, have sought, by wise and pacific legislation, to rescue the people of Kansas from the anarchy, the rapine, and murder brought upon them by the Black Republican party.

The democratic Senate, on the 3d of July, 1856, after a continuous session of twenty-one hours, passed, and sent to the Black Republican House, a great pacific measure, declaring null and void those acts of the Kansas Legislature repugnant to the bill of rights as embodied in our great charter of liberty—a measure which secures the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the writ of habeas corpus—prohibits religious tests for office, or an established religion—protects the rights of conscience, the persons and property of the people, and their right to hold and bear arms—forbids excessive bail, excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishments—declares that no test-oath, or oath to support any act of Congress or other legislative act, shall be required as a qualification for any office or trust, or for any employment or profession, or to serve as a juror, or to vote at an election—and that no tax shall be imposed upon the exercise of the right of suffrage, and guarantees to the people the free discussion of any law or subject of legislation, and in a free expression of opinion upon all questions whatever—provides for the appointment of five commissioners to arrange the preliminaries and superintend the election; for the registration of voters, and all other needful regulations necessary to a fair and impartial expression at the ballot-box of the *bona fide* residents of Kansas; and pledges the entire military force of the government to a pure and untrammelled ballot-box. If any resident shall have left the Territory, he is protected in his rights, provided he shall return by the 1st day of October, 1856. If any person is imprisoned for a violation of the obnoxious laws of Kansas, his prison-doors are opened, and he is restored to all his rights. But it also provides that the people, the *bona fide* residents of Kansas, shall regulate and form their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States; and they shall be admitted into the Union on a footing with the original States whenever they shall present a constitution with a republican form of government. Every Black Republican senator re-

sisted the bill at its various stages, and voted against it on its passage. Let it be proclaimed to the people, let it be known in every town and hamlet, that the democracy have given a fair and honest bill—one that will restore peace to a distracted country, correct the outrages and murders in an unhappy Territory, vindicate the majesty of the law, and protect the American citizen in an inalienable right—that the democracy have given such a bill to the Black Republican House of Representatives for their action. If they desire tranquillity in the States, peace and happiness to Kansas, and a correction of the violent abuses and outrages committed, they will immediately pass the Senate bill; but if outrage upon outrage and blood upon blood is necessary to the accomplishment of their political ends, necessary to the election of John C. Fremont, then will they refuse to pass the bill or to give repose to Kansas.

**GAYLAMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER**



Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

